

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR PATENT EXAMINATION POLICY
OFFICE OF PATENT LEGAL ADMINISTRATION

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

17 Sept 2002

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Hanadish Kumar Pal

9011911173/5628

(NAME)
(FACSIMILE NUMBER)

(ORGANIZATION)

(TELEPHONE NUMBER)

Cheryl Gibson-Baylor

(NAME and TELEPHONE NUMBER)

NUMBER OF PAGES

3

(INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE)

If you did not receive all pages or you have any questions about this transmission,
please contact the Deputy or Elizabeth Polley, OFFICE MANAGER of the OFFICE OF PATENT
LEGAL ADMINISTRATION (OPLA) as follows:

DIRECT TELEPHONE No.: 703-308-6302 FACSIMILE No.: 703-305-1613

Very truly yours,

Mr. Pal

Enclosed is the reference to the mail version.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D. C. 20531 /
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11-4761,996	01/12/2001	Aradish Kumar Pal		7422

NADISH KUMAR PAL
AASHA
AASHA
110934
PURA

EXAMINEE
DEPUMPO, DANIEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3611	<i>4</i>
DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002	

1. List 1 to 1 below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding

Art Unit 3611

1 The amendment filed June 6, 2001 has not been entered because it is not in proper format. In order to amend the claims, applicant is required to provide a "marked up" copy of the claims which shows the changes. Applicant is also required to provide a "clean copy" of the claims. Although this amendment has not been formally entered, the examiner has read the amendment and is aware of applicant's intentions. Entry of this amendment would not affect the rejections.

2 The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because it is too long. The Abstract should not exceed 25 lines of text and should be within the range of 50 to 250 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3 The title is objected to because it is too long. It should be short and specific as possible.

4 The top margins of the specification papers are not adequate. The top lines of the pages are illegible because holes have been punched in the top of the papers to fasten them to the U.S. Office file wrapper. New application papers with adequate top margins are required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

At page 5, line 24, it is disclosed that the batteries are "in the cavity behind the direct-drive motor". Since the motor appears to occupy the entire wheel rim of the vehicle, it is unclear how the batteries can be "behind" the motor.

At page 6, line 26, reference is made to axis "AA". Axis AA is not shown clearly in the drawings.

Art. Unit: 3611

At page 7, line 24, it is unclear what element comprises the "wine-glass-like shape". It is suggested to include an appropriate reference number for this element in the specification and

6. The claims are objected to because they are not properly numbered. The claims must be numbered consecutively. For purposes of this office action, the claims have been numbered as 1 through 6. Claims 1, 3 and 6 are considered to be independent claims since they do not refer back to any other claim. Appropriate correction is required. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35

U.S.C. second paragraph

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. Also, numerous elements lack proper antecedent basis. The structure which goes to defining the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and clearly stated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3611

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barber

Barber discloses a device having the structure to the degree claimed, in view of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections discussed above. The device includes two wheels 10, 12. Frame 14/48 is considered to comprise an axle to the same degree as claimed. The axle includes various extensions. The seat back and screen 144 are considered to comprise fenders to the same degree as claimed. As shown in fig. 11, the device includes a motor mounted on the axle. Passengers enter through the ends of the axle. The circumference is more than half the tire.

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber '395.

Art Unit: 3611

As set forth above, Barber '395 teaches substantially all that is claimed, but discloses the use of motor control buttons, instead of a joystick as claimed. However, Official Notice is taken of a joystick to control a motor is extremely common. It would have been obvious to Barber by using a joystick for motor control, to provide easy directional control over the

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

Barber '567, Cho, van den Berg, Freeman, Jackson, Dunay, Hessari, and Hoshino

disclosed various devices having features in common with the instant invention

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel G. DePumbo whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



DANIEL G. DEPUMBO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 10, 2002

Notice of References Cited

Applicant/Patent

Pal

Application/Control No.

08/781,090

Examiner

Daniel G. DePumpo

Art Unit

3611

Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

Document Number (including Code)	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification ²	
4,192,395	3/1980	Barber	180	218
4,163,567	8/1979	Barber	180	218
5,894,902	4/1999	Cho	180	65,6
US 2001/0042850A1	11/2001	Van Den Berg	180	218
282,299	7/1883	Freeman	180	218
3,313,365	4/1967	Jackson	180	218

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

Document Number (including Code)	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification ²	
3,326,322	2/1968	DT	Dunay	180	218
3,103,981	9/1962	DT	Hessari	180	218
6,092,273	4/1994	JP	Hoshino	260	266

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

Author, Title, Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Page(s)

Reference(s) Not Being Furnished with this Office Action. See 37 CFR 1.14(e)(2)(ii).

Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates.

² Classifications may be U.S. or foreign.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:



BLACK BORDERS

IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

FADED TEXT OR DRAWING



BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.